



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,772	09/27/2001	Tomio Amano	JP9-2000-0267US1 (590.083)	3441
35195	7590	10/27/2006		EXAMINER
				SINGH, RACHNA
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2176

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/965,772	AMANO, TOMIO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Rachna Singh	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendments and Remarks filed on 08/14/06.
2. Claims 1-2 and 4-23 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12-13, 15-17 and 19-22 are independent claims. Claims 1, 4, and 6 have been amended.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

*The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.*
4. Claims 1, 4 and 6 pages 2-4, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Evidence that Claims 1, 4 and 6 recite the limitations "...application data written in a markup description language, whereby the number of said errors incorrect character conversions occurring during the re-input of text is reduced... ", (see claim 1, page 2) "...wherein the number of said errors or incorrect character conversions is ultimately reduced " (see claim 4 page 2-3) "...whereby the number of selected character string errors is reduced " (see claim 6 page 3-4), thus The Examiner is unable to ascertain Applicant intention and It is unclear what Applicant's intended the metes and bounds of the claims are.

Clarification and/or correction are required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

***(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.***

6. **Claims 1-2 and 4-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Thielens et al. US Patent No. 5,666,139 filed 03/03/1995 (hereinafter Thielens), in view of Stern et al. US Pub No. 2003/0177115 A1 provisional No. 60/227,512 filed 08/24/2000 (hereinafter Stern), further in view of WordPerfect Version 5.1 for Dos – published by WordPerfect Corporation 1989 (hereinafter WordPerfect), and further in view of Corbin US006295542B1 filed 10/02/1998 (hereinafter Corbin).

**In regard to independent claim 1, defining a tag set to prevent errors or incorrect character conversions that occur frequently during the re-input of text; and using a tag set to add rewritten information to a predetermined portion of said application data** (as taught by Thielens at col. 17, line 65 through col. 18, line 20).

Thielens does not explicitly teach, **in markup decryption language used to write data or sentences**, however (as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0001] (i.e. method in which the probability of errors occurring during the preparation of the scanned documents), also (as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraph [0018] (i.e. document written in a mark-up language including, but not limited to, HTML (hypertext mark-up language) or VRML (virtual reality modeling language), dynamic HTML, XML

(extensible mark-up language) or XSL (XML styling language), or related computer languages thereof ).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Stern into Thielens to provide a way to include the feature, wherein in markup decryption language used to write data or sentences. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017];

Thielens and Stern do not explicitly teach **error correction**, however (as taught by WordPerfect at pages 573-591. The spell-checking feature has an option to correct spelling or grammar when you press (Ctrl-F2), which has the broadest reasonable interpretations as claimed, "error correction".

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of checking spelling featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the

world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017].

**Thielens, Stern and WordPerfect do not explicitly teach data written in a markup description language, whereby the number of said errors incorrect character conversions occurring during the re-input of text is reduced, however (as taught by Corbin at the Abstract and col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 65 pages), discloses the text is re-read, with the paragraphs/section headers masked off, to locate text strings within the body of the text which cross-reference the section headers, or term definitions, or external links.**

Once the text has been marked up, an index file (FIG. 2) is generated. This holds the (optional) table of contents, as well as any diagnostic information obtained during the processing of the original (input) HTML file. The index file is preferably linked to the original HTML file, as well as to other utility programs such as a spell checker/thesaurus, a search tool and to the other generated files containing the list of missing references, external references, term definitions, undefined terms and circular references is provided;

Also (see Corbin at col. 1, lines 10-45), described the shortcoming of time pressure in the preparation of the documents especially during negotiations. The documents may need to be redrafted many times to accommodate the changes, any of which may lead to errors and provides the solution (see Corbin at col. 2, line 55 through col. 4, line 15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Cobin's teaching into WordPerfect, Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of data written in a markup description language, whereby the number of said errors incorrect character conversions occurring during the re-input of text is reduced. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification, because they are from the same field of endeavor of error and/or spellchecker (i.e. cross referencing text), and to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017].

**In regard to dependent claim 2, wherein said tag set is defined for at least one of a character in the same shape, a similar character, a space or a character having a complicated shape, (as taught by Thielens at col. 3, line 15 through col. 4, line 21, i.e. Thielens provided a spelling checker, similar to conventional word processing computer systems. Such spelling checkers generally include a master list).**

**In regard to independent claim 4, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.**

**writing correction code, which is based on a predetermined algorithm,** however (as taught by WordPerfect at pages 580-581. The Wp{wp}.spw file containing

programming code necessary to run the speller, which has the broadest reasonable interrelations as claimed.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of Speller Dictionary featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017];

**In regard to dependent claim 5, wherein said correction code is calculated for a character string that represents an attribute value or an attribute name, and is written using a predetermined attribute for the description of an error code,** however (as taught by WordPerfect at pages 580-581. The Wp{wp}.spw file containing programming code necessary to run the speller, which has the broadest reasonable interrelations as claimed.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of Speller Dictionary featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available

though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017];

**In regard to independent claim 6, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1 and 4 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.**

**In regard to dependent claim 7, wherein said error correction codes are generated for all multiple character strings that are selected, and are added after predetermined elements of said application data have been written, however (as taught by WordPerfect at pages 579-583. The utility ADD in the supplementary dictionary, that allowing user to add to the main dictionary, which has the broadest reasonable interpretations as claimed.**

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of Speller Dictionary featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017].

**In regard to independent claim 8, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1 and 4 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,**

**writing said attribute types to said application data using a predetermined tag set,** (as taught by Thielens at col. 17, line 65 through col. 18, line 20, i.e. discloses the edit tag list, then the answer to step 454 is yes, whereupon an edit tag text insert pad, similar to the one shown in FIG. 7, is displayed in step 460, and the copy editor can add text to the edit tag insert pad in step 462 and display error message appears in step 468).

Thielens does not explicitly teach, **sorting, into predetermined attribute types, words in said application data that may constitute barriers in a context process; and transmitting or storing said application data with which said attribute types are included**, however, (as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraph [0014], i.e. the term "computational device" includes, but is not limited to, any type of computers operating according to any type of hardware and/or operating systems; or any device, which could be interpreted as claimed), also (as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraph [0017], i.e. "Web server" refers to a server capable of transmitting a Web page to the Web browser upon request, which could be interpreted as claimed), also (as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraph [0025], i.e. recognized words from the OCR process are preferably indexed with the associated probability of error, which could be interpreted as claimed).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Stern into Thielens to provide a way to include the feature, wherein an error correction support method for application data included transmitting, sorting words in said application data that may constitute barriers in a context process from predetermined attribute types, and writing said attribute types to

said application data using a predetermined tag set. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention, as taught as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007].

**In regard to dependent claim 9, wherein said words that are sorted into said predetermined attribute types and that may constitute barriers in said context process is at the least one of a set comprising proper nouns, alphabetic abbreviations, tag names, keywords that appear as attribute values, (as taught by Stern at page 4, paragraph [0049], i.e. as illustrated in FIG. 3A -FIG. 3B shows for example the word "Henry" even when misspelled as "Hehry", as shown by the underlined located search words).**

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Stern into Thielens to provide a way to include the feature, wherein said words that are sorted into said predetermined attribute types and that may constitute barriers in said context process is at the least one of a set comprising proper nouns, that appear as attribute values. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention, as taught as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007].

**In regard to independent claim 10, is directed to a system for performing the method of claims 1, 4 and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.**

**In regard to dependent claim 11**, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 6 and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to independent claims 12-13**, are directed to a system for performing the method of claims 1 and 4 and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 14**, is directed to a system for performing the method of claims 4, 5, and in further view of the following and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**when said automatic correction is determined to be possible**, (as taught by Thielens at col. 9, line 45 through col. 10, line 15, i.e. discloses a global search and replace the spelling of the word with automatic effect).

**In regard to independent claim 15**, is directed to a system for performing the method of claims 1, 8, and in further view of the following and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**a word dictionary and individual character recognition results obtained from said text information**, however (as taught by WordPerfect at pages 573-591. The spell-checking feature has an option to correct spelling or grammar when you press (Ctrl-F2), which has the broadest reasonable interpretations as claimed).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of checking spelling featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without

requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017];

**In regard to independent claim 16**, is directed to a system for performing the method of claims 4, 8, and in further view of the following and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**compares character with entries in a word dictionary**, however (as taught by WordPerfect at pages 573-591. The spell-checking feature has an option to correct spelling or grammar when you press (Ctrl-F2), which has the broadest reasonable interpretations as claimed, "error correction".

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of checking spelling featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017];

**In regard to claims 17-18**, is directed to a system for performing the method of claims 1, 4 and in further view of the following and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**said application data including correction information that is printed on a paper-based document or form**, (as taught by Thielens at col. 1, lines 30-35, i.e. The job of the copy editor is to carefully review the manuscript for changes therein. Specifically, the copy editor first manually folios or numbers all of the pages, and then reviews and edits the manuscript for grammatical and contextual errors by writing the changes on the printed manuscript, and flagging author queries and rewrites),

**second computer receives, from said first computer**, as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0017]-[0018], i.e. "Web browser" refers to any software program, which can display text, graphics, or both, from Web pages on World Wide Web sites. Hereinafter, the term "Web server" refers to a server capable of transmitting a Web page to the Web browser upon request, which could interpreted as claimed).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Stern into Thielens to provide a way to include the feature, wherein an error correction support method for application, which could be extended to an application data provision system such that the second computer receives, from said first computer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution from any data sources, e.g. printed newspaper, microfilm, digital data...), which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention, as taught as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraphs [0003] and [0007].

**In regard to independent claim 19,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 17-18 above, and in further view of the following and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**comparing individual character recognition results with entries in a word dictionary,** however (as taught by WordPerfect at pages 573-591. The spell-checking feature has an option to correct spelling or grammar when you press (Ctrl-F2), which has the broadest reasonable interpretations as claimed, "error correction".

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified WordPerfect into Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of checking spelling featured of WordPerfect. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017];

**In regard to independent claim 20,** is directed to a medium for performing the method of claims 1, 6 and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to claims independent claims 21-22,** is directed to a medium for performing the method of claims 1, 4 and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to claims dependent claim 23, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, 4, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale;**

**removing said correction code and said predetermined tags and returning said application data written in a markup decryption language to its original form,** however (as taught by Corbin at the Abstract and col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 65 pages), discloses the text is re-read, with the paragraphs/section headers masked off, to locate text strings within the body of the text which cross-reference the section headers, or term definitions, or external links. wherein the cross-references are matched up as far as possible with section/paragraph headers and the original HTML text is marked up automatically with hyperlinks, using the unambiguous section labels and cross-references as HTML anchors and destinations .

Once the text has been marked up, an index file (FIG. 2) is generated. This holds the (optional) table of contents, as well as any diagnostic information obtained during the processing of the original (input) HTML file. The index file is preferably linked to the original HTML file, as well as to other utility programs such as a spell checker/thesaurus, a search tool and to the other generated files containing the list of missing references, external references, term definitions, undefined terms and circular references is provided;

Also (see Corbin at col. 2, line 55 through col. 4, line 15), discloses  
(a) locating label strings within said document, each label string labeling an associated part of said document;

(b) converting each said located label string into standard format such that the said associated parts of said document are each unambiguously labeled by said standard format;

c) locating cross-reference strings within said document, said cross-reference strings referring to parts of said document labeled by said label strings;

(d) converting each said cross-reference string into said standard format such that said converted cross-reference strings refer unambiguously to one or more labelled parts of said document;

(e) collating said standard format cross-reference strings with said standard format label strings; and

(f) providing a program link between said cross-reference strings and those labeled parts of said document to which they refer.

Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation; wherein returning said application data written in a markup decryption language to its original form would have been an obvious variant of a set of converting each said located label string into standard format such that disclose in steps (a)-(f) above, to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Cobin's teaching into WordPerfect, Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of removing said correction code and said predetermined tags and returning said application data written in a markup decryption language to its original form. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated

to perform such a modification, because they are from the same field of endeavor of error and/or spellchecker (i.e. cross referencing text), and to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017].

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-2 and 4-23 and particularly the independent claim 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12-13, 15-17 and 19-22 have been considered.

8. Beginning on page 11 of the REMARKS (hereinafter the Remarks), Applicant argues the following issues, which are accordingly addressed below.

9. Applicant argues on pages 11-12, the 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejections. Applicant merely states "the claim terminology is clear and is adequately defined in the specification". Applicant's arguments do not overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejections.

10. Applicant incorporates by reference remarks made in previous office actions with respect to the teachings of Thielens, Stern, and WordPerfect. Since Applicant has not presented new arguments with regards to the teachings of Thielens, Stern, and

WordPerfect, the Examiner refers to previous office actions responding to these arguments and also the comments below.

Applicant previously argued the Applicant' invention broadly contemplates method and system that generally relates to Markup text data error correction;

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner respectfully notes that the Applicant argues the amended portion of the claims limitation, to address the amendments, the Examiner introduce the **Corbin** reference (see the rejection above for detail). Please note that Thielens, Stern and WordPerfect are fairly teach and/or suggest most of the unamended portion of the claims limitation (i.e. 2, 5, 7, and 9-22).

Additionally, Thielens and Stern reference teaches and/or suggests all limitations of independent claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 but the **error correction**, however (as taught by WordPerfect at pages 573-591. The spell-checking feature has an option to correct spelling or grammar when you press (Ctrl-F2), which has the broadest reasonable interpretations as claimed, "error correction".

In addition, Thielens at col. 1, lines 30-35, i.e. the job of the copy editor is to carefully review the manuscript for changes therein. Specifically, the copy editor first manually folios or numbers all of the pages, and then reviews and edits the manuscript for grammatical and contextual errors by writing the changes on the printed manuscript,

and flagging author queries and rewrites, also Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0017]-[0018], i.e. "Web browser" refers to any software program, which can display text, graphics, or both, from Web pages on World Wide Web sites. Hereinafter, the term "Web server" refers to a server capable of transmitting a Web page to the Web browser upon request. Examiner read the above in the broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim limitation, wherein data generated by first, second computer using markup language would have been an obvious variant of "Web browser" and "Web server" refers to a server capable of transmitting a Web page to the Web browser upon request, since the well known standardized language using in the "Web browser" and "Web server" is some type of markup language to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that markup.

Thus the rejection of all the independent claims and their dependencies (i.e. Claims 1-2 and 4-22) in the previous rejection in combination with the current rejection states above are deemed to be proper at least for above the reason at this time.

On pages 16-17, Applicant argues Corbin is non-analogous prior art and cannot be relied upon for rejecting Applicant's claims because it has nothing to do with error prevention/correction. Applicant further argues on page 18 that Corbin's combination with the other references would never realize the advantage of error correction solution. Examiner disagrees.

Applicant states that Corbin is not related to error prevention and deals with scanning of a document for headings and cross-references in order to **remove any ambiguities**. Such ambiguities and removal of ambiguities can be interpreted as errors and “error prevention or correction” respectively. However, as stated in the rejections above, Thielens, Stern and WordPerfect do not explicitly teach **data written in a markup description language, whereby the number of said errors incorrect character conversions occurring during the re-input of text is reduced**, however (as taught by Corbin at the Abstract and col. 15, line 50 through col. 16, line 65 pages), discloses the text is re-read, with the paragraphs/section headers masked off, to locate text strings within the body of the text which cross-reference the section headers, or term definitions, or external links.

Once the text has been marked up, an index file (FIG. 2) is generated. This holds the (optional) table of contents, as well as any diagnostic information obtained during the processing of the original (input) HTML file. The index file is preferably linked to the original HTML file, as well as to other utility programs such as a spell checker/thesaurus, a search tool and to the other generated files containing the list of missing references, external references, term definitions, undefined terms and circular references is provided;

Also (see Corbin at col. 1, lines 10-45), described the shortcoming of time pressure in the preparation of the documents especially during negotiations. The documents may need to be redrafted many times to accommodate the changes, any of

which may lead to errors and provides the solution (see Corbin at col. 2, line 55 through col. 4, line 15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Cobin's teaching into WordPerfect, Thielens and Stern to provide a way to include the means of data written in a markup description language, whereby the number of said errors incorrect character conversions occurring during the re-input of text is reduced. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification, because they are from the same field of endeavor of error and/or spellchecker (i.e. cross referencing text), and to provide error correction solution, which could be easy to perform automatically, without requiring extensive manual intervention in any computational devices, and available though the world wide web, as taught by Stern at page 1, paragraph [0007] and also as taught by Stern at page 2, paragraphs [0014] and [0017].

As stated above, Examiner has provided a motivation as to why Corbin is combinable with the other references. It is noted that Applicant merely states that the references are not combinable without addressing what flaws appear in Examiner's previous motivation to combine.

In view of the comments above, the rejection is maintained.

***Conclusion***

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2176

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RS  
10/19/06

  
Heather R. Herndon  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100